

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-11 are pending.

Claims 1, 3-10 are rejected.

Claim 2 is cancelled.

Claim 11 is new.

For Claim 1, the support for the claim is found in the following places:

- Means for storing a set of at least one template file is indicated in page 3, lines 9-11.
- Installation application refers to figure 1-5 and the page 3, lines 27-31.
- The template is selected from the set of templates as indicated in page 5, lines 15-17.
- The list of template is upgradeable according to the page 3, lines 12-15.
- The template is adapted for customizing the behavior of a wizard adapted for presenting said parameters to a user, as indicated in the description page 3, lines 5-8.
- The template is selected from the set of at least one template, as indicated in the description page 5, lines 9-11.

The claim 1 has been amended to clarify the application which is the installation application of the description. The claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the configuration parameters are the parameters as indicated in the description. These parameters are used for the configuration, an example being given in the annex A of the description.

Claim 11 is added as to clarify the parameters defining the operation of the wizard. The support for this claim is found in the description on page 5, lines 6-12, of the specification, and in other places.

No new matter was entered in view of these amendments.

I. Rejection of Claims 1 and 3-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,029,203 to Bhatia et al. (hereafter referred to as 'Bhatia'). Applicants disagree with this ground of rejection.

In the present application, a set of templates is available at the device. According to the specification on page 3: "multiple templates are allowed so that multiple DSL configuration types can be used on just one router". In page 4: "The wizard generates HTML pages based on the template file.", and "An ISP requiring a different wizard behavior will design a template file". In the application, a template refers to multiple HTML pages that form a wizard behavior. The template file defines the wizard behavior.

In Bhatia, on column 54, lines 25-30, web pages are used for querying a user stationed at a workstation to enter information needed to configure the LAN modem. The web pages are constructed in real-time from predefined stored web page templates, as indicated in column 54, lines 31-33. According to page 24, lines 57-66, "the web server generates a predefined sequence of graphical web pages". Bhatia discloses on column 25, lines 8-56, and column 53, line 63 to column 54, line 5, that the web pages are constructed from predefined stored templates containing HTML code that is common to all pages. The web server dynamically inserts appropriate predefined code segments in lieu of a so-called placeholder in the template. Bhatia does not disclose a template selected from a set of at least on template.

The template of claim 1 corresponds to the predefined stored web page templates, unlike what is disclosed as defined in column 54, line 1 of Bhatia. That is, only one such predefined stored web page templates is used in Bhatia. More specifically, in Bhatia the same sequence of graphical web pages is always used where the wizard in Bhatia operates the same, all of the time. This is different than the use of multiple templates (wizard operation) as in Claim 1.

In Bhatia, the template file is the web template. The wizard of Bhatia is an HTML page with parameters that are presented to a user. The wizard of Bhatia is not a set of HTML pages. This is indicated in column 7, lines 4-26 that the template is a web page template; which means that a template in Bhatia corresponds to a web page.

Consequently the elements of Claim 1 are neither disclosed nor suggested in Bhatia.

Furthermore, from Bhatia, the skilled in the art would not be conducted to the teaching of claim 1. Bhatia does not disclose the same wizard type as the wizard of the application. Bhatia doesn't disclose the same template as in the application.

In the present application for Claim 1, the installation application applies a template for customizing the operation of a wizard. The wizard is adapted to present the selecting parameters for configuring the device.

In Bhatia, as indicated in column 7, lines 4-26 and in column 24, line 57 to column 25, line 56, the installation application is adapted to build an HTML page based on page template and parameters, where the HTML pages are further adapted to help the end user to configure the device. Nothing in Bhatia would lead the skilled in the art to the template and the wizard of the application, where the template defines at least one of the parameters among the number of screens, the titles of the screens, subtitles and help text, the questions asked on every screen, and the selection possibilities for every screen.

For the reasons given above, Applicants assert that Claim 1 is patentable over the cited art of record. In addition, the Applicants assert that Claims 3-8 are patentable, as such claims depend on allowable Claim 1.

II. Rejection of Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,029,203 to Bhatia et al. (hereafter referred to as 'Bhatia') in view of Polit et al. (U.S. Patent 6,407,998). Applicants disagree with this ground of rejection because Claim 9 is patentable as such a claim depends on allowable Claim 1.

III. Rejection of Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,029,203 to Bhatia et al. (hereafter referred to as 'Bhatia') in view of Polit et al. (U.S. Patent 6,407,998) and in further view of the Examiner's official Notice. Applicants disagree with this ground of rejection.

In the rejection the Examiner writes, "Regardless of which source has higher priority the outcome is predictable. In other words information from the highest priority source will outweigh and overwrite and information provided from a lower priority source". The Applicants are assuming that the Examiner is tying together two points for the purposes of anticipation of Claim 10: (a) it is known to use profiles that are ordered according to different priorities (b) it is known to overwrite a lower priority with a higher priority.

Without having the benefit of reading any additional reference to support this position (because the Examiner is taking Official Notice) and Applicants will answer the following points. If the Applicants are wrong about the statements above, the Applicants apologize in advance and request that the Examiner either restate the reasons for the application of Official Notice, or supply a reference to support the Examiner's position.

The Examiner does not disclose or suggest where in any of these references, with official notice, where these specific profile listed in Claim 10 are shown in the prior art, or where the specific order of profiles order is shown or disclosed in the cited prior art.

In addition, Claim 10, as amended, clarifies where a missing parameter is taken from. That is, if a higher profile value is missing, a parameter can be taken from a profile associated with a lower priority. In the rejection, the Examiner cites to Polit (col. 8, lines 28-31) which discloses the following, “[t]he priority profile may be transmitted from a service provider, entered by a user, or may comprise pre-stored default information, or may be derived from a combination of these sources”. This disclosure of Polit in view of the other cited art of record is that a priority profile which is used to determine a data rate for a particular user can be derived from a priority profile or what hierarchy should be given for processing different data/messages. This does not disclose or suggest that a missing parameter, for a higher level profile, will be taken from a lower level profile, as claimed in Claim 10.

Applicants therefore assert that Claim 10 is patentable as such a claim depends on allowable Claim 1, and the elements cited above are not found in the cited art of record.

Respectfully submitted,
J. Deleu et al.

By:


Joel Fogelson
Registration No. 43613
Telephone No.: (609) 734-6809

Thomson Licensing, LLC
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
September 3, 2009

Application No. 11/534,629

PF020154



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on:

9/3/09
Date

A handwritten signature is written over a horizontal line.